



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,985	12/29/2005	Marco Corti	PO883OUS00/MP	3562
881	7590	03/27/2008	EXAMINER	
STITES & HARBISON PLLC			NGUYEN, ANTHONY H	
1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET				
SUITE 900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2854	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,985	CORTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANTHONY H. NGUYEN	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/27/2006.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1-23 are objected to as being generally narrative, functional, awkward and including inferentially recited elements and lack of proper antecedent basis. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, claim 1, 13,18 and 19 are narrative, functional and awkward. The elements “a sufficiently long portion of cloth” (claim 1, line 4), “a rectilinear deformable strip” (claim 1 line 8) and “ a rectilinear deformable presser” (claim 1 line 9) and “channels” (claim 1 line 21) are inferentially recited. Additionally, there is no proper antecedent basis for “the rubber cylinders” (claim 1 line 1), “the said cylinders” (claim 1, line 3), “the said sprayed liquids” (claim 1, line 5) and “the whole” (claim 1, line 10). The language “it” (claim 1, lines 2, 14,) is unclear to what element or device it is referred to. Correction is required.

The above are simply examples of the errors present. Applicant is required to carefully review the claims and eliminate all such errors.

To the extent the claims are clear and positively recite structure, it appears that the following prior art rejection is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 13,14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmutz (US 2002/0189473).

With respect to claim 1-3 and 23, Schmutz teaches an equipment 2 for cleaning cylinders 4 having means 50 for spraying cleaning liquid on a cleaning cloth 28 which is pressed on the surfaces of the cylinders for cleaning the surface via a pressing element 6 as shown in Figs 1 and 5 of Schmutz. With respect to claims 13 and 14, Schmutz teaches a bar 18, 19 which has a rounded upper edge and lower edge and contains the pressing element and spraying nozzles 54 (Schmutz , Figs.3 and 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-12 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schmutz (US 2002/0189473) in view of Hara et al. (US 6,101,943).

With respect to claims 4-8 and 10-12, Schmutz teaches an equipment for cleaning cylinders having substantially the structure as recited. Schmutz does not teach the projecting parts on the surface of the pressing element. Hara et al. teaches the conventional projecting parts 10 on the surface of a pressing element 8 as shown in Figs. 7,8 and 14 and col.5 lines 34,35. In view of the teaching of Hara et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the pressing element of Schmutz by providing the projecting parts on the surface of a pressing element as taught by Hara et al. to improve the efficiency of cleaning the surface of a cylinder. With respect to claims 9-12, the selection of desired size of the pressing element or presser and the projecting parts on the surface of the presser would be obvious through routine experimentation depending upon the material used for presser, cleaning cloth which is pressed by the presser and cleaning liquid to be used for cleaning in order to get best possible cleaning operation. With respect to claims 18 and 22, the positions as recited for cleaning the surface of a cylinder are well known in the art. For example, Schmutz teaches the cleaning equipment 2 which is positioned at about 3 o'clock and Hara et al. teaches the cleaning device 2 which is positioned at 2 o'clock. Therefore, the selection of the desired position for a cleaning equipment would be obvious depending upon a printing press's configuration.

Conclusion

The patents to Corti et al., Krieser and Robertson are cited to show other structures having obvious similarities to the claimed structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169. The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen, can be reached on (571) 272-2258.

The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

/Anthony H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2854